



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,749	11/19/2003	Jung Pill Kim	2003P52591US	6180

46798 7590 12/05/2006
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
Gero McClellan / Infineon / Qimonda
3040 POST OAK BLVD.,
SUITE 1500
HOUSTON, TX 77056

EXAMINER

PHAN, TRONG Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2827

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/716,749

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

TRONG PHAN

Art Unit

2827

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____ *Phan Trong*
13. ☐ Other: _____.

**TRONG PHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the rejection of cancelled claims 12, 21, 23 and 27:

The final rejection has not set forth the rejection of these cancelled claims. Cancelled claims 12, 21, 23 and 27 are included in Paragraph 2 of the final rejection because of inadvertent typing error;

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 3, 9-11, 14, 16, 18-19, 25-26 and 28-29 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Snyder et al., 6,829,190:

Snyder et al., 6,829,190, does show in Fig. 5C, as the temperature increasing from -40 to 100, the erase pulse width (—ERASE PW curve) decreasing; as shown in Fig. 5D, as the pulse width decreasing, the saturation voltage of the erase margin voltage VME decreasing (it should be noted that the saturation voltage of the erase margin voltage is the turn-on voltage of the erase voltage as well known in the art), therefore, the temperature increasing, the erase voltage decreasing;

Therefore, the rejection of claims 5-6 and 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al., 6,829,190; in view of Applicant's Fig. 1 Prior Art and the rejection of claims 7-8 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snyder et al., 6,829,190, in view of Applicant's Fig. 1 Prior Art, and further in view of Park et al., 6,958,947, are also proper.

The examiner clearly set forth the comparison between the voltage generator as recited in claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13-20, 25-26 and 28-30 of the present invention with the voltage generator as recited in claims 1-28 of U.S. Patent No. 7,009,904, based on a claim-by-claim basis in accordance with nonstatutory double patenting rejection. The addition of the same Figs. 2-3 and 4A-B in the present invention and in U.S. Patent No., 7,009,904, is just only a further explanation for the purpose of helping Applicant to understand why the rejection set forth.